

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0178 (3724.Palm)

### REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

In the specification, paragraph [0040] has been amended.

Claim 14 is currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-8, 12, 14, 16-20, and 22-24 are now pending in this application.

### Specification

In Section 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure because paragraph [0040] should read "a diagram 400 of a user". Applicants have amended paragraph [0040] accordingly.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In Section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 12, 14, 16-20, and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nahi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,084,584) in view of Lebby et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,115,618), and further in view of Failla (U.S. patent No. 5,128,662), and further in view of Mayer, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,690,337).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 14, and 20 include limitations that the display system includes a flexible screen display and also that the display system includes display drivers capable of updating screen resolution and screen display size based upon

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0178 (3724.Palm)

the current expansion of the display screen (particularly claims 1 and 14) and also that there are two display units a first non-flexible display unit and a second flexible display unit and a foldable display unit that maybe attached to and detached from the processing unit (particular claim 20). Although Failla discloses a foldable display device for a portable electronic device, Failla does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the flexible and foldable display device should be used or has any benefit of being used in a situation where the display unit is detachable from the processing unit and expandable once detached. Further, Failla does not disclose, teach or suggest that the expandable display can be used in different size configurations (see Applicant's FIG. 3, for example). What is disclosed by Failla is that the display can be unfolded and used and then refolded and stowed for travel. Applicants claim a system in which the display can be used in a compact state or an expanded state. This flexibility is not disclosed taught or suggested by any proper combination of the references and is particularly advantageous for portable handheld devices.

Further, Nahi et al. in view of Lebby et al., does not provide a motivation to combine Failla with Nahi et al. and Lebby et al. because no motivation or desirability is provided by Nahi et al. and Lebby et al. to include a flexible and/or foldable display unit on a portable handheld device. Lebby et al. only teaches that a display maybe decoupled from a portable electronic device, but does not provide any motivation or desirability for providing that the device be a foldable and expandable device. Therefore, none of the references teach or disclose a desirability for displays that can be expanded and used and then collapsed and used in a more portable arrangement as is most useful for a handheld portable device. Accordingly, applicants teach the advantages of providing a detachable display that may be interchanged with a variety of types of displays and the displays may be flexible and foldable for varying sizes to display various types of information. No combination of Nahi et al., Lebby et al., and Failla teaches the desirability for providing this combination of elements, which is recited in independent claims 1, 14, and 20.

Further still, the Examiner indicated that Mayer teaches the concept of drivers for changing resolution and screen size attributes when larger screens are used. Albeit, Mayer

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0178 (3724.Palm)

teaches the use of such drivers, Mayer does not provide any desirability to combine such teachings with those of Nahi et al., Lebby et al., and Failla. The teachings of Mayer do not provide any suggestion about using such drivers with handheld computing devices in which screen resolutions and screen sizes are changed as a user changes the size of the display from an expanded state to a more compact state. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine Nahi et al., Lebby et al., Failla, and Mayer.

Accordingly, for one or more of the reasons provided above, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 14, and 20 and their respective dependent claims are therefore allowable.

#### **Double Patenting**

In Section 18 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that a number of the claims are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of co-pending applications. Applicants reserve the right to file a Terminal Disclaimer in this case should the claims be found allowable, as currently requested. No Terminal Disclaimer is being filed with this amendment.

\* \* \* \* \*

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0178 (3724.Palm)

Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date April 18, 2005

By Alistair K. Chan

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 26371  
Telephone: (414) 297-5730  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Alistair K. Chan  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,603